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### Algae Counterplan

#### Text: The United States federal government should amend relevant definitions in the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 to include algae-derived fuels eligible for all tax credits, subsidies, and price supports.

#### Amending the RFS to include price supports for algae spurs green crude production. This provides clean renewable fuel – solves energy dependence and breaks the food/fuel link

Jason Pyle (Chief Executive Officer, Sapphire Energy) June 12 2008 “Renewable Fuels And Food Prices,” CQ Congressional Testimony

First, let me thank the Committee for its leadership on alternative, renewable fuels. Your keen focus and vision have resulted in the first ever Renewable Fuel Standard. Although there will inevitably be elements of RFS that will improve over time, you've guided the country along on the right path. Second, within the RFS debate, I want to thank this Committee for its vision and support for technology neutrality in RFS legislation, even though that vision did not survive final passage. As you predicted by supporting a technology neutral position, we are now seeing the evolution of an entirely new generation of renewable fuels. These fuels transcend the use of food as fuel feedstock. The current dilemma that pits fuel against food is just the first of many consequences of a technology-specific RFS. Without a technology-neutral RFS, this nation will not meet its goals of providing 32 billion gallons of renewable fuel by 2022. Although last year's Energy Independence and Security Act has yet to foster such solutions, this Committee should be applauded for anticipating an ever-expanding universe of alternative and renewable fuels. That's why I am here. I'm Jason Pyle, Chief Executive Officer of Sapphire Energy. Sapphire is one of several of this nation's best technology companies working to produce the next generation of renewable fuels. At Sapphire, we focus on the production of current fuel products, such as gasoline, diesel and aircraft fuel, from completely renewable sources, such as photosynthetic microorganisms, or algae. Our mission is to produce fuels for today's oil and gasoline infrastructure, and two weeks ago we announced that Sapphire had produced the first ever renewable, ASTM-compliant, 91 octane gasoline from microorganisms. Please refer to the attached two documents for more background on Sapphire Energy. The Problem One of the many reasons we have cheap food is the availability of cheap energy. We cannot expect to turn large amounts of food back into energy in an economic manner. In today's debate between food and fuel, we should not have to make a choice. Both are critical to the economy, the environment and the world at large; we should not match one against the other. But when price and demand rise for one, both suffer. Instead of a Pyrrhic choice between food and fuel, I offer the opportunity to transcend the debate and produce ample supplies of both, leading this nation toward energy independence. Instead of a dispute between two basic necessities, we need a dialogue that supports truly sustainable alternative fuel sources. Over the past year we have all seen prices and demand rise for commodities such as corn, sugar and vegetable oil. The entire world now feels the pressure. Daily we are faced with reports of people who struggle to afford essentials. A host of factors has contributed to price increases for food and fuel: weather, heightened demand, a weaker dollar, decreasing supplies. Just like energy, food is linked in a global market. Once we begin fueling our cars with food crops, we witness international repercussions. Riots occurred in Mexico earlier this year over expensive corn flour. This price increase has been attributed to U.S. demand for corn-based ethanol products, leaving less maize available for export. Protests over similar issues have occurred around the world, contributing to inflation and political instability. Even at an increased rate of production, current domestic biofuel processes will meet part, but not all, of U.S. demand. If the entire annual domestic soybean crop of 3 billion bushels were converted to biodiesel at the current efficiency of 1.4 gallons per bushel, it would provide about 6.5% of U.S. diesel fuel production. Though certainly a valuable asset to our fuel supply, it is clear that a spectrum of additional and diverse biofuels sources will be necessary to fulfill demand. Congress first adopted the Renewable Fuels Standard in 2005, but wisely recognized that neither biodiesel nor ethanol would be the final solution. It created the program as a bridge to a new generation of fuels, and established a system of incentives to create a marketplace for new technologies. Congress should consider whether the incentives are neutral and fair. Ask whether these mechanisms will lead to the support and development of fuels that will give America true energy independence. Congress should ensure that the next round of incentives can be applied to advanced technologies such as Sapphire's. American innovation is the heart of our people and our economy; I urge you to support this with additional legislation that promotes a technology-neutral RFS. The Solution Food for fuel concerns are real, but can be managed. Industries such as ethanol from corn and biodiesel from vegetable oil can continue to play an important role in the energy mix. However, if we intend to practically and economically reach the goals of the RFS, we must be ready to rapidly embrace new fuel technologies. We must call on American ingenuity and entrepreneurialism for the solutions. When Congress passed the Energy Policy Act of 2005, it put the country on a path toward an energy future independent of imported resources. As Americans, we must support this vision. We should strive to maximize production, create fuel-efficient cars, reduce the amount of driving we do and, finally, develop alternatives to fossil fuels. All these efforts deserve increased support. But without a truly new source of fuel, the system will remain in turmoil, prices will soar and the conflict between food and fuel will persist. Senators, my colleagues and I at Sapphire Energy have been thinking about this for a long time. We knew that an energy source based on agriculture would serve this country best as a stepping stone to a green energy future. We knew that energy requiring vast amounts of fresh water resources was not a viable option. And, finally, if we wanted to make a difference quickly, we knew we needed a fuel that could be transported and refined just like petroleum. Two years ago we asked ourselves, "In a perfect world, how should the next generation of fuel be produced and distributed?" These were our founding principles: 1.Fuel production must not use farmland. Period. 2.Fuel production must be carbon neutral. 3.Fuel production and delivery must use the existing petroleum infrastructure. 4.Fuel production must scale domestically to reach tens of billions of gallons per year. 5.The next generation of fuels must be compatible with today's vehicles. That sounded like a tall order. But Americans have dreamed big and delivered in the past - atomic energy, highways and railroads that crisscross our nation, a man on the moon, mapping the human genome. Now, a similar ingenuity has developed a completely renewable and homegrown source of gasoline. I offer that we do not have to sacrifice food production for fuel production. We do not have to choose between powering our industries and feeding the hungry. The Sapphire processes and technologies are so revolutionary that the company is at the forefront of an entirely new industrial category called "Green Crude Production". Products and processes in this category differ significantly from other biofuels because they are made solely from photosynthetic microorganisms, sunlight and CO2; do not result in biodiesel or ethanol; enhance and replace petroleum-based products; are carbon neutral and renewable; and don't require any food crop or agricultural land. The Sapphire process produces a replica of light sweet crude, green crude that can be used in traditional refining to make real gasoline, diesel, and aircraft fuel. Our feedstocks produce 10 to 100 times more energy per acre than cropland biofuels. A side benefit of our process is that the microorganisms consume pollutants and convert them to fuel. Using the Sapphire process, we have dramatically altered the domestic energy and petrochemical landscape and avoided the food versus fuel debate. Please allow me to reiterate, the Sapphire process does not create ethanol; it does not produce biodiesel; it does not use crops or valuable farmland. Sapphire fuel is the fuel we use today, the kind that is in your car or truck or airplane right now. It's gasoline, diesel and aircraft fuel. Senators, this is a solution. This is a truly renewable, truly sustainable, alternative fuel- "Sapphire's green crude oil". This fuel, Sapphire fuel, is the world's first truly renewable petrochemical product, produced by converting sunlight and CO2 into a renewable, carbon-neutral alternative to conventional fossil fuels, without the drawbacks of current biofuels. This fuel is compatible with the current energy infrastructure- cars, refineries, and pipelines. Sapphire's scalable production facilities will produce this fuel economically because production will be modular, transportable, fueled by sunlight, and not constrained by arable land, crops, or other natural resources. Sapphire has turned sunlight into gasoline.

#### Food/fuel link creates unique risks for escalation – food spikes now exacerbates current economic conditions – causes rampant civil conflict \*\*\*gender modified\*\*\*

Manila Times November 5 2008 “Let’s attend to food security”, http://www.manilatimes.net/national/2008/nov/05/yehey/opinion/20081105opi1.html

He tells the world that the economic meltdown now afflicting the globe is gripping (hu)mankind with “the twin crises of finance and food.” The world, he warns, will be “far worse” than the Great Depression of the 1930s, the Black October of 1987 or the Asian Economic Collapse of 1997. That is because the financial crisis is accompanied by “high food prices and food shortages, and the steady erosion of agriculture and rural economies.” He says. “Food availability and affordability are the bedrocks of any society. During the Great Depression, Black October and the Asian Economic Crisis, food prices were at historic lows. No matter how dire the situation, food was still plentiful and cheap. Today, the story is different. “Food is in shorter supply; prices have been steadily climbing since 2001 and have escalated dramatically since 2006. According to the tracking of our Organization, food prices rose by 9 percent in 2006, 24 percent in 2007 and surged 51 percent in the past 12 months. “Although we saw some price drops for certain food commodities in the past months, average prices are still much higher than normal and the international markets remain volatile. During normal times, that level of ‘sticker shock’ would spell hardship for most working people and the poor. Coupled with an economic crisis of the enormity taking place today, the impact could be catastrophic.” Dr. He calls on us to give due importance to food security. “The role of food security in wider events should not be underestimated. Food shortages and runaway food price inflation have a history of leading to social unrest and political upheaval. The current crisis has already sparked riots and social turbulence in over 30 countries and contributed to the fall of at least one elected government.

#### Food riots escalate to global war – ignite all regional hot spots

Bernardo V. Lopez September 10 1998 “Global recession phase two: Catastrophic (Private sector views)”, BusinessWorld

Certainly, global recession will spawn wars of all kinds. Ethnic wars can easily escalate in the grapple for dwindling food stocks as in India-Pakistan-Afghanistan, Yugoslavia, Ethiopia-Eritrea, Indonesia. Regional conflicts in key flashpoints can easily erupt such as in the Middle East, Korea, and Taiwan. In the Philippines, as in some Latin American countries, splintered insurgency forces may take advantage of the economic drought to regroup and reemerge in the countryside. Unemployment worldwide will be in the billions. Famine can be triggered in key Third World nations with India, North Korea, Ethiopia and other African countries as first candidates. Food riots and the breakdown of law and order are possibilities. Global recession will see the deferment of globalization, the shrinking of international trade - especially of high-technology commodities such as in the computer, telecommunications, electronic and automotive industries. There will be a return to basics with food security being a prime concern of all governments, over industrialization and trade expansions. Protectionism will reemerge and trade liberalization will suffer a big setback. The WTO-GATT may have to redefine its provisions to adjust to the changing times. Even the World Bank-IMF consortium will experience continued crisis in dealing with financial hemorrhages. There will not be enough funds to rescue ailing economies. A few will get a windfall from the disaster with the erratic movement in world prices of basic goods. But the majority, especially the small and medium enterprises (SMEs), will suffer serious shrinkage. Mega-mergers and acquisitions will rock the corporate landscape. Capital markets will shrink and credit crisis and spiralling interest rates will spread internationally. And environmental advocacy will be shelved in the name of survival. Domestic markets will flourish but only on basic commodities. The focus of enterprise will shift into basic goods in the medium term. Agrarian economies are at an advantage since they are the food producers. Highly industrialized nations will be more affected by the recession. Technologies will concentrate on servicing domestic markets and the agrarian economy will be the first to regrow. The setback on research and development and high-end technologies will be compensated in its eventual focus on agrarian activity. A return to the rural areas will decongest the big cities and the ensuing real estate glut will send prices tumbling down. Tourism and travel will regress by a decade and airlines worldwide will need rescue. Among the indigenous communities and agrarian peasantry, many will shift back to prehistoric subsistence economy. But there will be a more crowded upland situation as lowlanders seek more lands for production. The current crisis for land of indigenous communities will worsen. Land conflicts will increase with the indigenous communities who have nowhere else to go either being massacred in armed conflicts or dying of starvation. Backyard gardens will be precious and home-based food production will flourish. As unemployment expands, labor will shift to self-reliant microenterprises if the little capital available can be sourced. In the past, the US could afford amnesty for millions of illegal migrants because of its resilient economy. But with unemployment increasing, the US will be forced to clamp down on a reemerging illegal migration which will increase rapidly. Unemployment in the US will be the hardest to cope with since it may have very little capability for subsistence economy and its agrarian base is automated and controlled by a few. The riots and looting of stores in New York City in the late '70s because of a state-wide brownout hint of the type of anarchy in the cities. Such looting in this most affluent nation is not impossible. The weapons industry may also grow rapidly because of the ensuing wars. Arms escalation will have primacy over food production if wars escalate. The US will depend increasingly on weapons exports to nurse its economy back to health. This will further induce wars and conflicts which will aggravate US recession rather than solve it. The US may depend more and more on the use of force and its superiority to get its ways internationally.

### Russia Sphere of Influence

#### Russia is focused on expanding into Latin America – part of its grand strategy to increase international credibility

Sudarev 2012

[Vladimir Sudarey, Doctor of Political Science, Professor of the European and American Countries’ History and Politics Department of the MGIMO University, “" Is Russia returning to Latin America?"” February 20, 2012, http://russiancouncil.ru/en/inner/?id\_4=252#top]

Latin American region has recently been often mentioned among new priority dimensions of Russian foreign policy. Despite the difficulties of both objective and subjective nature, the comeback of Russia to Latin America can provide Russia with new reliable partners and strengthen its position in a nascent multi-polar world. The nineties can be regarded as lost years for Russian policy in Latin America. In fact, Russia didn’t pursue any policy there. Traditionally, as in the Soviet times, this region stood low on the national foreign policy agenda. Of course, there have been undertaken some successful actions – for example, in 1996-1997 Russian Foreign Minister Yevgeny Primakov paid visits to the region during which the whole package of agreements on cooperation with Mexico, Cuba, Venezuela, Argentina, Colombia, and, most importantly, with Brazil (about strategic partnership in the 21 century and creation of a greater Russia-Brazil committee) were sign of the Rio Group and held official talks with them. Both sides agreed not to confine themselves to regular contacts (launched in 1995) within the framework of the UN General Assembly, but also conduct meetings in Russia and countries of the Group member-states. By mid-decade the exchange of high level delegations between the sides had intensified. Only one example, in November 2008 President Medvedev visited four countries during his tour of the region - Peru, Brazil, Venezuela and Cuba. Commenting on his visit, President Medvedev remarked: “…we visited the states which previous Russian leaders had never been to… It means only that we failed to pay due attention to these countries before, and, to a certain extent, it is only now that we are starting a full-fledged and I hope mutually beneficial cooperation with the heads of these states and between our economies. он отметил: We mustn’t be shy and timid and be afraid of competition. We must boldly engage in the battle”. In order to display its interest to the presence in the region Russia resorted to a number of un-common and spectacular actions. In November 2008 a warship squadron with the fleet nuclear-powered cruiser “Peter the Great” of the Russian Navy as a flagship entered the territorial waters of US-hostile Venezuela to participate in joint naval exercises of the North Fleet of the Russian Federation Navy. Simultaneously, within the framework of the resumed patrolling of the Atlantic and the Pacific oceans two Russian long-range strategic bombers landed at a Venezuelan naval base. The so-called comeback of Russia to Latin America was to a great extent preconditioned by the “leftist drift” in the region which resulted in the emergence of the group of states that viewed the expanding relations with Russia as an important lever for strengthening their position in conflict relations with the USA. Many of these countries perceived Russia as the successor of the former USSR might and influence, with the vision of a new world order of both sides being practically identical – it should be multilateral, not individually tailored to the interests of a single superpower. This position was set out in numerous joint documents signed at the summits – practically all the leaders of the most prominent Latin American countries paid official visits to Moscow during the first decade of the 21st century. The breakthrough happened also in the military and technical field. Starting from 2004 Venezuela has begun purchases of scale of the Russian arms to the amount of over $4bln. Russia established military and technical cooperation with other countries of the region apart from Venezuela: Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador and Bolivia also procured Russian military hardware. Russia tried to establish closer economic ties with its major partners in the region. At the end of the decade Russia’s oil and gas producing companies LUKOIL and GASPROM were already operating in Venezuela. RUSAL made heavy investments in bauxite industry of Guyana. ROSNEFT got its chunk for oil exploration in Cuban shelf of the Mexican Gulf. Trade between Russia and the countries of the region has been roaring recently – over the last decade trade turnover has tripled and amounted to $15bln [4]. However, despite the qualitative changes in the structure of Russian export – the share of machinery and equipment has a little increased – it still leaves much to be desired. Take Brazil, for example: mineral fertilizers have made up 90% of Russian export, while Brazil has been exporting to Russia mostly meat and tropical used to have Cuba as a strategic partner, the Russian Federation, having curtailed the ties with the Island of Freedom, didn’t bother to start looking for new partners and paid as little attention to the relations with Brazil as with any other Latin American country. If Russia is really interested in serious and politically influential partners, then it is the Brazil dimension that should be prioritized as the major vector of Russian policy in the region. It means establishing a special system of partnership which will include an overhaul of the current system of trade and economic relations, an introduction of a new system of preferential terms of advanced know-how transfer and exchange, particularly in aerospace field. For that sake it’s necessary to maximally intensify the relations with Brazil’s leadership and take them to a higher level, with the head of state or the government taking control of it. However, the growing understanding of the Russian upper echelons of power of the necessity to shift the focus of economic cooperation with the countries of the region on to scientific and technical sphere arouses certain optimism. It is in the field of advanced technologies where Russia is most competitive, and no wonder that the main emphasis during the April 2010 visit of President Medvedev to the countries of the region was laid on this very issue. Low competitiveness of Russia vis-à-vis other countries undertaking huge efforts with a view to building up their political and economic position in this region continues to persist. Besides, our investment capability is also much lower than that of USA, China, EU and even India. Nonetheless, in spite of the difficulties, both objective and subjective, the trend of Russia’s presence expansion in the region may gain further momentum in the forthcoming decades, provided adequate efforts are taken. In this case Latin American dimension of Russian foreign policy has all chances to make it a separate independent direction which can win Russia new beneficial partners and enhance its position in a nascent multi-polar world.

###### US encroachment makes US-Russia war inevitable

**Carpenter and Logan 2009**

[Carpenter, Ted Galen, and Justin Logan. "Cato Handbook for Policymakers." *Relations with China, India, and Russia*. CATO, 2009. Web.MA]

Few people want to return to the animosity and tensions that marked¶ relations between Washington and Moscow throughout the cold war. But¶ clumsy policies by both the United States and Russia now threaten to¶ bring back those unhappy days. Washington continues to press for further¶ expansion of NATO to Russia’s border and is meddling in parochial¶ disputes between Russia and its small neighbor Georgia. For its part, the¶ Medvedev-Putin regime shows signs of trying to cause headaches for the¶ United States in the Caribbean.¶ Both governments need to adopt more cautious policies. Secretary of¶ State Condoleezza Rice once famously dismissed the concept of spheres¶ of influence as an obsolete notion, and that view has become all too¶ common among America’s foreign policy elite. But that doctrine is very¶ much alive, and U.S. and Russian leaders ignore that reality at their peril. If a new cold war emerges, Washington will have done much to invite¶ it. But Russia has become needlessly provocative as well. The dark hints¶ in summer 2008 that it might station bombers in Cuba were reckless. For¶ Americans, even the possibility that Moscow might deploy a nuclear capable weapon system in Cuba brings back memories of the most nightmarish episode of the cold war—the Cuban missile crisis. No American¶ government would tolerate such a move—nor should it. Moscow’s growing flirtation with Venezuela’s Hugo Cha´vez, an obnoxious nemesis of¶ the United States, is also creating gratuitous tensions. Moscow’s joint air¶ and naval exercises with Venezuelan military forces in September 2008¶ especially did not improve relations with America.¶ Those moves likely reflect mounting Russian anger at U.S. policies¶ that seem calculated to undermine Russia’s influence in its own backyard¶ and even humiliate Moscow. Washington’s ‘‘in your face’’ approach is¶ not a recent development. U.S. officials took advantage of Russia’s economic and military disarray during the 1990s to establish a dominant¶ position in central and eastern Europe. Washington successfully engineered¶ the admission of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic to NATO in¶ 1998—over the Yeltsin government’s objections. That expansion of the¶ alliance was nonprovocative, though, compared with the second round¶ earlier this decade that incorporated Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania, entities¶ that had been part of the Soviet Union.

#### The impact is extinction

Bostrom 2002

[Nick, Dir. Future of Humanity Institute and Prof. Philosophy – Oxford U., Journal of Evolution and Technology, “Analyzing Human Extinction Scenarios and Related Hazards”, 9, March, <http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html>]

The first manmade existential risk was the inaugural detonation of an atomic bomb. At the time, there was some concern that the explosion might start a runaway chain-reaction by “igniting” the atmosphere. Although we now know that such an outcome was physically impossible, it qualifies as an existential risk that was present at the time. For there to be a risk, given the knowledge and understanding available, it suffices that there is some subjective probability of an adverse outcome, even if it later turns out that objectively there was no chance of something bad happening. If we don’t know whether something is objectively risky or not, then it is risky in the subjective sense. The subjective sense is of course what we must base our decisions on.[2] At any given time we must use our best current subjective estimate of what the objective risk factors are.[3] A much greater existential risk emerged with the build-up of nuclear arsenals in the US and the USSR. An all-out nuclear war was a possibility with both a substantial probability and with consequences that might have been persistent enough to qualify as global and terminal. There was a real worry among those best acquainted with the information available at the time that a nuclear Armageddon would occur and that it might annihilate our species or permanently destroy human civilization.[4] Russia and the US retain large nuclear arsenals that could be used in a future confrontation, either accidentally or deliberately. There is also a risk that other states may one day build up large nuclear arsenals. Note however that a smaller nuclear exchange, between India and Pakistan for instance, is not an existential risk, since it would not destroy or thwart humankind’s potential permanently. Such a war might however be a local terminal risk for the cities most likely to be targeted. Unfortunately, we shall see that nuclear Armageddon and comet or asteroid strikes are mere preludes to the existential risks that we will encounter in the 21st century.

### Politics

#### Uniqueness: CIR Will pass – Boehner and Ryan are building momentum

Berman 7/10/13 (Russell, “Boehner warns House GOP will be weaker without immigration reform”, <http://thehill.com/homenews/house/310259-boehner-gop-would-be-in-much-weaker-position-without-action-on-immigration>, CMR)

Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) and Rep. Paul Ryan (R-Wis.) urged their House Republican colleagues to pass immigration reform legislation in a closed-door meeting Wednesday, with the Speaker arguing his conference would be “in a much weaker position” if it failed to act.¶ A divided House Republican conference met for more than two hours in the basement of the Capitol to begin hashing out a response to the sweeping immigration bill the Senate passed last month.¶ Boehner spoke at the outset of the meeting and reiterated his pledge that no immigration bill, including a final House-Senate conference report, would come to the floor without the support of a majority of the House GOP. But both he and Ryan, the House budget chief and the GOP’s vice presidential nominee in 2012, made the case that the House GOP should take action on immigration in a way that reflected the party’s principles, Republicans in the room said.¶ Boehner “said we’d be in a much weaker position if we didn’t act,” according to Rep. Tom Cole (R-Okla.). “He clearly wants to act, thinks something needs to get done. Frankly, our principles are probably closer to where the American people are, but it’s incumbent upon us to act.”¶ The party leadership did not lay out a timetable for floor votes in the meeting, though members indicated leaders could develop a timeline in the coming weeks.¶ Members said it was likely that the House would wait until after the August congressional recess to act, although votes on individual border security and interior enforcement bills that have passed out of committee were possible before then.¶ Following the meeting, Ryan said he was optimistic the House would act.¶ “I think our members are ready to tackle this issue. It needs to be fixed,” he told reporters. “There is an emerging consensus that our immigration system is broken, that we need to fix it, and we need to do it in a very thorough way.¶ “I feel very good. I feel we are in very good position to do it the right way. We don't want to rush anything,” he said before diving into a crowded elevator.

**Link: Drains capital – Backlash and hostage taking on unrelated priority legislation is empirically proven, likely in future and specifically true for Rubio**

**LeoGrande, 12**

William M. LeoGrande School of Public Affairs American University, Professor of Government and a specialist in Latin American politics and U.S. foreign policy toward Latin America, Professor LeoGrande has been a frequent adviser to government and private sector agencies, 12/18/12, http://www.american.edu/clals/upload/LeoGrande-Fresh-Start.pdf

The Second Obama Administration Where in the executive branch will control over Cuba policy lie? **Political considerations played a major role in Obama's Cuba policy during the first term**, albeit not as preeminent a consideration as they were during the Clinton years. In 2009, **Obama's** new foreign policy **team** got off to a bad start when they **promised Senator Menendez that they would consult him before changing Cuba policy. That was the price he extracted for providing Senate Democrats with the 60 votes needed to break a Republican filibuster on a must-pass omnibus appropriations bill to keep the government operating. For the next four years, administration officials worked more closely with Menendez, who opposed** the sort of major **redirection of policy** Obama had promised, **than they did with senators** like John Kerry (D-Mass.), chair of the Foreign Relations Committee, **whose views were more in line** with the president's stated policy goals. **At the Department of State**, Assistant Secretary Arturo Valenzuela **favored initiatives to improve relations with Cuba**, but he **was stymied by indifference or resistance elsewhere in the bureaucracy**. Secretary Hillary Clinton, having staked out a tough position Cuba during the Democratic primary campaign, was **not inclined to be the driver for a new policy**. At the NSC, Senior Director for the Western Hemisphere Dan Restrepo, who advised **Obama** on **Latin America policy** during the 2008 campaign, **did his best to avoid the Cuba issue because it was so fraught with political danger. When the president finally approved** the resumption of people-to-people **travel** to Cuba, which Valenzuela had been pushing, **the White House political team delayed the announcement for several months at the behest of** Debbie Wasserman **Schultz. Any easing of** the travel **regulations**, she warned, **would hurt Democrats' prospects in the** upcoming **mid-term** elections.43 **The White House shelved the new regulations** until January 2011, and then announced them late Friday before a holiday weekend. **Then, just a year later, the administration surrendered to** Senator **Rubio's demand** that it limit the licensing of travel providers **in exchange for him dropping his hold on the appointment** of Valenzuela's replacement.44 With Obama in his final term and Vice-President Joe Biden unlikely to seek the Democratic nomination in 2016 (unlike the situation Clinton and Gore faced in their second term), politics will presumably play a less central role in deciding Cuba policy over the next four years. **There will still be the temptation**, however, **to sacrifice Cuba policy to mollify congressional conservatives, both Democrat and Republican, who are willing to hold other Obama initiatives hostage to extract concessions on Cuba**. **And since Obama has given in to such hostage-taking previously, the hostage-takers have a strong incentive to try the same tactic again.** The only way to break this cycle would be for the president to stand up to them and refuse to give in, as he did when they attempted to rollback his 2009 relaxation of restrictions on CubanAmerican travel and remittances. Much will depend on who makes up Obama's new foreign policy team, especially at the **Department of State**. John Kerry has been a strong advocate of a more open policy toward Cuba, and worked behind the scenes with the State Department **and USAID** to clean up the "democracy promotion" program targeting Cuba, as a way to win the release of Alan Gross. A new secretary is likely to bring new assistant secretaries, providing an opportunity to revitalize the **Bureau of Western Hemisphere Affairs,** which **has been thoroughly cowed by congressional hardliners**. But **even with new players in place, does Cuba rise to the level of importance that would justify a major new initiative and the bruising battle with conservatives on the Hill?** Major **policy changes that require a significant expenditure of political capital rarely happen unless the urgency of the problem forces policymakers to take action.**

#### Internal Link: Obama will be pushing Republicans to pass immigration reform; strategy must be bipartisan in nature

NICHOLAS 7/7/13 (PETER, “President to Pressure House GOP on Immigration Bill

Plan Includes Visits to Battleground States With Robust Latino Vote”, The Wall Street Journal

July 7, 2013, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887324867904578592032121418230.html?mod=WSJ\_WSJ\_US\_News\_6

President Barack Obama plans to mount a more visible effort to push through an immigration overhaul that is heading toward an uncertain fate in the Republican-controlled House, marking a risky shift from the largely hands-off approach he has employed to date.¶ Mr. Obama likely will travel in the coming months to some of the battleground states he won with the help of a robust Latino vote—possibly including Nevada, New Mexico, Colorado and Florida—to argue the economic case for passing the immigration overhaul. He will also try to convince reticent Republican lawmakers that the GOP's viability as a national party with aspirations of winning back the White House is linked to the fate of the bill, White House officials said.¶ More¶ Turning Permanent Residents Into Citizens¶ Some Republicans, including former Florida Gov. Jeb Bush, have made a similar argument, citing the GOP's need to listen to the growing Latino vote. But many GOP House members who are focused on their own re-election prospects may be unmoved by arguments about what's needed to win back the White House in 2016. Their bigger concern may be potential primary challenges from the right, coupled with genuine misgivings about the legislation.¶ Mr. Obama's strategy carries personal risks as well. Should he take on a partisan tone, he may antagonize House Republicans and scuttle a bill that is the centerpiece of his second-term agenda, feeding perceptions that he is a lame duck.¶ On immigration, Mr. Obama played a largely behind-the-scenes role as the bill worked its way through the Senate, with his aides providing technical assistance and giving quiet advice to lawmakers. With the action moving to the House, the White House is devising a new strategy to push the bill through a chamber that is more resistant to the prospect of a path to citizenship for the 11 million people living in the U.S. illegally.¶ House Speaker John Boehner (R., Ohio) has said he won't let a bill come to a vote unless it has the support of a majority of Republican members—a difficult standard to meet. He will meet with fellow Republican House members on July 10 to develop a "path forward" on immigration, an aide said.¶ As he travels to presidential swing states, Mr. Obama won't attempt to pressure particular House members, but rather underscore the point that the GOP must improve its standing among Latino voters if it hopes to win presidential races down the road, White House officials said.¶ He will go to "areas that Republicans hope to do better in and need to do better in," one White House official said.¶ Another of Mr. Obama's imperatives is ensuring the momentum created by the Senate's solid bipartisan vote doesn't fade, White House officials said. To that end, the White House is enlisting business leaders in hopes of persuading House Republicans to back the bill. Last Tuesday, White House Chief of Staff Denis McDonough met privately with the American Bankers Association, the National Retail Federation, the Financial Services Forum and other business trade groups, to discuss ways to advance the bill.¶ In his travels, Mr. Obama will need to calibrate his message so as not to drive off potential GOP votes. Republicans warn that Mr. Obama could damage the bill's chances if he paints Republicans as heartless obstructionists determined to keep undocumented immigrants in legal limbo.¶ Rep. Peter King (R., N.Y.) said in an interview, "If he's going to say that anyone who doesn't favor this bill is bigoted or biased, it's not going to get anywhere. It's just going to build up resistance. You can legitimately say you shouldn't be giving legal status to 11 million people who violated the law."¶ The White House insisted the president won't make the argument in such terms, but instead point to the economic benefits of giving citizenship to entrepreneurial immigrants, Obama aides said.¶ Mr. Obama is under pressure from his base not to worry excessively about Republican sensibilities. Democratic campaign operatives are eager to use the immigration issue as a cudgel against Republicans in the 2014 midterm elections if the bill fails.¶ Rep. Steve Israel (D., N.Y.), chairman of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, released a memo last month singling out 23 House Republicans who might be amenable to arguments that the immigration bill should pass. In each district, Mr. Obama fared well in the 2012 election, capturing between 46% and 58% of the vote, the memo shows.¶ Should the immigration bill collapse in the House, "then we raise holy hell," one national Democratic campaign official said.¶ Still, Democratic campaign officials recognize that traditional campaign tactics may not prove effective in this instance, given that so many Republicans are comfortably ensconced in safe seats.¶ In the end, the bill's fate hinges on Mr. Boehner's willingness to permit a vote on the bill even if it is clear a majority of House Republicans oppose passage, they said. Support from a minority of House Republicans and strong Democratic backing could provide enough votes to pass a bill, even though the GOP controls the chamber.¶ Sen. Richard Durbin (D., Ill.), a member of the bipartisan group of eight senators who pushed the immigration bill through the Senate, said he worries House members are sometimes too insulated from national issues. "But I think the national party understands the importance of this, and they can appeal to Republican members of the House," he said.

#### Impact: Key to the economy and heg

**Palomarez 3/6** – President & CEO of the United States Hispanic Chamber of Commerce (3/6/2013, Javier, “The Pent Up Entrepreneurship That Immigration Reform Would Unleash,” <http://www.forbes.com/sites/realspin/2013/03/06/the-pent-up-entrepreneurship-that-immigration-reform-would-unleash/>, CMR)

**Washington recently took a major step forward in negotiations on comprehensive immigration reform**. Tom **Donohue, President of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and** Richard **Trumka, the President of the AFL-CIO, announced a compromise for dealing with lesser-skilled workers in immigration reform**.¶ This is progress. In 2007, neither side would even come to the table to discuss their differences, so this effort sends a clear signal that both corporate America and our country’s workers understand the importance of comprehensive immigration reform to their bottom line.¶ How did this compromise come about?¶ The main difference between now and 2007 is that today the role of immigrants and their many contributions to the American economy have been central in the country’s national conversation on the issue.¶ Never before have Latinos been so central to the election of a U.S. President as in 2012. New evidence about the economic importance of immigration reform, coupled with the new political realities presented by the election, have given reform a higher likelihood of passing.¶ As the President & CEO of the country’s largest Hispanic business association, the U.S. Hispanic Chamber of Commerce (USHCC), which advocates for the interests of over 3 million Hispanic owned businesses, I have noticed that nearly every meeting I hold with corporate leaders now involves a discussion of how and when immigration reform will pass. The USHCC has long seen comprehensive immigration reform as an economic imperative, and now the wider business community seems to be sharing our approach. It is no longer a question of whether it will pass.¶ **Out of countless conversations with business leaders in virtually every sector and every state, a consensus has emerged: our broken and outdated immigration system hinders our economy’s growth and puts America’s global leadership in jeopardy.**¶ **Innovation drives the American economy, and without good ideas and skilled workers, our country won’t be able to transform industries or to lead world markets as effectively as it has done for decades.**¶Consider some figures: Immigrant-owned firms generate an estimated $775 billion in annual revenue, $125 billion in payroll and about $100 billion in income. A study conducted by the New American Economy found that over 40 percent of Fortune 500 companies were started by immigrants or children of immigrants.¶ Leading brands, like Google, Kohls, eBay, Pfizer, and AT&T, were founded by immigrants. Researchers at the Kauffman Foundation released a study late last year showing that from 2006 to 2012, one in four engineering and technology companies started in the U.S. had at least one foreign-born founder — in Silicon Valley it was almost half of new companies.¶ **There are an estimated 11 million undocumented workers currently in the U.S. Imagine what small business growth in the U.S. would look like if they were provided legal status, if they had an opportunity for citizenship. Without fear of deportation or prosecution, imagine the pent up entrepreneurship that could be unleashed.** After all, these are people who are clearly entrepreneurial in spirit to have come here and risk all in the first place.¶ Immigrants are twice as likely to start businesses as native-born Americans, and statistics show that most job growth comes from small businesses.¶ While **immigrants** are both critically-important consumers and producers, they **boost the economic well-being of native-born Americans as well**.¶ Scholars at the Brookings Institution recently described the relationship of these two groups of workers as complementary. This is because lower-skilled immigrants largely take farming and other manual, low-paid jobs that native-born workers don’t usually want.¶ For example, when Alabama passed HB 56, an immigration law in 2012 aimed at forcing self-deportation, the state lost roughly $11 billion in economic productivity as crops were left to wither and jobs were lost.¶ **Immigration reform would also** address another important angle in the debate – the need to **entice high-skilled immigrants**. Higher-skilled immigrants provide talent that high-tech companies often cannot locate domestically. High-tech leaders recently organized a nationwide “virtual march for immigration reform” to pressure policymakers to remove barriers that prevent them from recruiting the workers they need.¶ Finally, and perhaps most importantly, fixing immigration makes sound fiscal sense. Economist Raul Hinojosa-Ojeda calculated in 2010 that **comprehensive immigration reform would add $1.5 trillion to the country’s GDP over 10 years and add $66 billion in tax revenue** – enough to fully fund the Small Business Administration and the Departments of the Treasury and Commerce for over two years.¶ **As Congress continues to wring its hands and debate the issue, lawmakers must understand what both businesses and workers already know: The American economy needs comprehensive immigration reform.**

## On Case

### Water

#### **Ogallala Aquifer will dry up inevitably- alt causes**

Snyder, 13

[Michael- B.S. in Commerce Univ. of Virginia, J.D. Univ. of Florida, “30 facts about the coming water crisis that will change the lives of every person on the planet,” March 4th, 2013, http://theeconomiccollapseblog.com/archives/30-facts-about-the-coming-water-crisis-that-will-change-the-lives-of-every-person-on-the-planet]

The world is rapidly running out of clean water. Some of the largest lakes and rivers on the globe are being depleted at a very frightening pace, and many of the most important underground aquifers that we depend on to irrigate our crops will soon be gone. At this point, approximately 40 percent of the entire population of the planet has little or no access to clean water, and it is being projected that by 2025 two-thirds of humanity will live in "water-stressed" areas. But most Americans are not too concerned about all of this because they assume that North America has more fresh water than anyone else does. And actually they would be right about that, but the truth is that even North America is rapidly running out of water and it is going to change all of our lives. Today, the most important underground water source in America, the Ogallala Aquifer, is rapidly running dry. The most important lake in the western United States, Lake Mead, is rapidly running dry. The most important river in the western United States, the Colorado River, is rapidly running dry. Putting our heads in the sand and pretending that we are not on the verge of an absolutely horrific water crisis is not going to make it go away. Without water, you cannot grow crops, you cannot raise livestock and you cannot support modern cities. As this global water crisis gets worse, it is going to affect every single man, woman and child on the planet. I encourage you to keep reading and learn more.¶ The U.S. intelligence community understands what is happening. According to one shocking government report that was released last year, the global need for water will exceed the global supply of water by 40 percent by the year 2030...¶ This sobering message emerges from the first U.S. Intelligence Community Assessment of Global Water Security. The document predicts that by 2030 humanity's "annual global water requirements" will exceed "current sustainable water supplies" by forty percent.¶ Oh, but our scientists will find a solution to our problems long before then, won't they?¶ But what if they don't?¶ Most Americans tend to think of a "water crisis" as something that happens in very dry places such as Africa or the Middle East, but the truth is that almost the entire western half of the United States is historically a very dry place. The western U.S. has been hit very hard by drought in recent years, and many communities are on the verge of having to make some very hard decisions. For example, just look at what is happening to Lake Mead. Scientists are projecting that Lake Mead has a 50 percent chance of running dry by the year 2025. If that happens, it will mean the end of Las Vegas as we know it. But the problems will not be limited just to Las Vegas. The truth is that if Lake Mead runs dry, it will be a major disaster for that entire region of the country. This was explained in a recent article by Alex Daley...¶ Way before people run out of drinking water, something else happens: When Lake Mead falls below 1,050 feet, the Hoover Dam's turbines shut down – less than four years from now, if the current trend holds – and in Vegas the lights start going out.¶ Ominously, these water woes are not confined to Las Vegas. Under contracts signed by President Obama in December 2011, Nevada gets only 23.37% of the electricity generated by the Hoover Dam. The other top recipients: Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (28.53%); state of Arizona (18.95%); city of Los Angeles (15.42%); and Southern California Edison (5.54%).¶ You can always build more power plants, but you can't build more rivers, and the mighty Colorado carries the lifeblood of the Southwest. It services the water needs of an area the size of France, in which live 40 million people. In its natural state, the river poured 15.7 million acre-feet of water into the Gulf of California each year. Today, twelve years of drought have reduced the flow to about 12 million acre-feet, and human demand siphons off every bit of it; at its mouth, the riverbed is nothing but dust.¶ Nor is the decline in the water supply important only to the citizens of Las Vegas, Phoenix, and Los Angeles. It's critical to the whole country. The Colorado is the sole source of water for southeastern California's Imperial Valley, which has been made into one of the most productive agricultural areas in the US despite receiving an average of three inches of rain per year.¶ Are you starting to get an idea of just how serious this all is?¶ But it is not just our lakes and our rivers that are going dry.¶ We are also depleting our groundwater at a very frightening pace as a recent Science Daily article discussed...¶ Three results of the new study are particularly striking: First, during the most recent drought in California's Central Valley, from 2006 to 2009, farmers in the south depleted enough groundwater to fill the nation's largest human-made reservoir, Lake Mead near Las Vegas -- a level of groundwater depletion that is unsustainable at current recharge rates.¶ Second, a third of the groundwater depletion in the High Plains occurs in just 4% of the land area. And third, the researchers project that if current trends continue some parts of the southern High Plains that currently support irrigated agriculture, mostly in the Texas Panhandle and western Kansas, will be unable to do so within a few decades.¶ In the United States we have massive underground aquifers that have allowed our nation to be the breadbasket of the world. But once the water from those aquifers is gone, it is gone for good. That is why what is happening to the Ogallala Aquifer is so alarming. The Ogallala Aquifer is one of the largest sources of fresh water in the world, and U.S. farmers use water from it to irrigate more than 15 million acres of crops each year. The Ogallala Aquifer covers more than 100,000 square miles and it sits underneath the states of Texas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Colorado, Kansas, Nebraska, Wyoming and South Dakota. Most Americans have never even heard of it, but it is absolutely crucial to our way of life. Sadly, it is being drained at a rate that is almost unimaginable.

### Climate Change

#### Warming is natural

**BELL 11-3-2010** (Larry, Prof at U Houston, http://www.forbes.com/2010/11/02/global-warming-climate-change-al-gore-opinions-columnists-larry-bell.html)

Yes, there is no doubt about it. The planet is experiencing a siege of abnormally high temperatures. This has now been going on for 15,000 to 18,000 years, a life-friendly period known as an interglacial cycle. During glacial ages that exist about 90% of the time, our Northern Hemisphere is mostly covered with ice up to several miles thick. Records of these alternating glacial and interglacial fluctuations reveal the near regularity of an electrocardiogram over many hundreds of thousands of years … beginning long before the man-made inventions of agriculture, smokestacks, SUVs and carbon offset trading scams. And just how abnormally warm is it now? Let's consider some "recent" comparisons. Temperatures are probably about the same today as during a "Roman Warm Period" slightly more than 2,000 years ago, and much warmer than the "Dark Ages" that followed. They are cooler than the "Medieval Warm Period" about 1,000 years ago when Eric the Red and his Icelandic Viking tribe settled on grasslands of Greenland's southwestern coast, and much warmer than about 400 years ago when the Northern Hemisphere plunged into depths of a "Little Ice Age" (not a true Ice Age). Near the end of that period Washington's army suffered brutal cold at Valley Forge (1777), and Napoleon's, a frigid retreat from Russia (1812).

#### Warming is due to solar variations

**WOJICK 2005** (David, President of Climatechange.org, Electricity Daily, January 10)

U.S. climate change research policy is seriously out of whack. There is growing evidence that solar variability is responsible for most of the global warming in the last century ( ED, Dec 15,2004). Coal fired power plants are being blamed for much of this warming, but if it is actually the sun at work then we are wasting time and a lot of money trying to cut carbon dioxide emissions. Clearly the Bush administration should be looking into this solar angle. But it is not, even though its $2 billion a year Climate Change Science Program just underwent a massive review. The CCSP is doing outdated, entrenched science, that assumes humans are to blame for what may well be a natural phenomenon. The problem is that the federal science program was defined 15 years ago. It was assumed then that the climate is naturally unchanging, so humans must be the cause of the observed warming. Since then we have learned that climate, like weather, is never constant, but the research program has not changed accordingly. In the last 6-8 years the sun has emerged as a big driver of Earth s climate change. For example, consider the findings of the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, which conducts massive periodic reviews of climate science. In 1995 the IPCC said that the sun was not a factor in the warming over the last century. In 2001 it concluded that more than half of that warming was solar induced, not human induced. Given that the IPCC tends to be biased toward the theory of human induced warming, this was a huge admission. The scientific trend marked by the IPCC s flip flop has continued. The research problem is that the known variations in solar energy are not strong enough to account for all of the observed global warming. But in the last five years a number of indirect, amplifying mechanisms have been identified. The result is that we now know how the sun might account for all of the warming, and there is growing evidence that it does. Research problems do not get any better, or more important, than this. The policy problem is that the CCSP has no plans to do solar-climate research. Because carbon dioxide was assumed to be the culprit, the annual CCSP budget has a $110 million carbon cycle component. But CO2 is a trace gas and the CO2 increase to date cannot explain the observed warming, without assuming a water vapor feedback, so the CCSP also includes a $150 million water-cycle component. There is no corresponding solar-cycle research, what little is done on solar is round-off error. The word solar barely occurs in the new CCSP Strategic Plan, and occurs not at all in the plan s milestones. In short, the climate research program has assumed an old, speculative answer to the warming question (humans are doing it) and is throwing vast quantities of money at that answer. Billions of dollars over the last 15 years. Now that a new answer is emerging (it s the Sun, after all) the CCSP has failed to notice. Clearly its time to put some of these big science bucks into solar climate research. U.S. energy policy hangs in the balance.

#### Warming won’t cause extinction

– their impacts are alarmism, not supported by experts

Mauldin 6/4/12 – B.S. and M.S. in electrical engineering from Cal-Berkeley, registered professional engineer (Paul, “Global Warming Alarmism: At the Tipping Point of Credibility?”, <http://smartenergyportal.net/article/global-warming-alarmism-tipping-point-credibility>)

If we believe all we're told then there is no hope. Why change anything? But, to the frustration and anger of the alarmists, we don't believe all we're told about a global warming doomsday. There's a growing belief both in the lay and scientific communities that there's another side to the story. There's mounting evidence that the presuppositions about human-caused climate change are wrong or at the best, distorted. The earth is warming, yes (although that's not all that clear to some), but our planet has gone through warming/cooling cycles in the past. Yes, there is a correlation with CO2 concentrations, but it's not clear which came first, the warming or the change in CO2. And the CO2/temperature-rise pairing cycles have also occurred throughout the past. But isn't the global warming skeptic community pretty much a bunch of ignorant, untrained, flat-earther types? Not at all, according to the study reported in Nature. (see The polarizing impact of science literacy and numeracy on perceived climate change risks). It turns out that the more scientifically literate you are, the less concerned you are about climate change. Scientific literacy and training leads one to follow their own rationale rather than to follow the herd. "Seeming public apathy over climate change is often attributed to a deficit in comprehension. The public knows too little science, it is claimed, to understand the evidence or avoid being misled. Widespread limits on technical reasoning aggravate the problem by forcing citizens to use unreliable cognitive heuristics to assess risk. We conducted a study to test this account and found no support for it. Members of the public with the highest degrees of science literacy and technical reasoning capacity were not the most concerned about climate change. Rather, they were the ones among whom cultural polarization was greatest. This result suggests that public divisions over climate change stem not from the public’s incomprehension of science but from a distinctive conflict of interest: between the personal interest individuals have in forming beliefs in line with those held by others with whom they share close ties and the collective one they all share in making use of the best available science to promote common welfare." If something just doesn't smell right about the smug but dire predictions frantically pumped out by the media and platoons of alarmist bloggers, you're going to question it. Particularly if you have a fundamental understanding of science and experience with the vagaries of the science/politics/media triumvirate. In the long run, continued climate-change fear mongering, hyperbole and name calling will destroy what little public interest is left. We might even see a 'brown' rebound, and that would be tragic.

### Impact Framing

#### Great-power nuclear war’s possible

**Wittner 11** Lawrence Wittner is Professor of History emeritus at SUNY/Albany "Is a Nuclear War With China Possible?" 11/30/2011 [www.huffingtonpost.com/lawrence-wittner/nuclear-war-china\_b\_1116556.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/lawrence-wittner/nuclear-war-china_b_1116556.html)

While nuclear weapons exist, there remains a dangerthat **they will be used**. After all, for centuries national conflicts have led to wars, with nations employing **their deadliest weapons**. The current deterioration of U.S. relations with China might end up providing us with yet another example of this phenomenon. The gathering tension between the United States and China is clear enough. Disturbed by China’s growing economic and military strength, the U.S. government recently challenged China’s claims in the South China Sea, increased the U.S. military presence in Australia, and deepened U.S. military ties with other nations in the Pacific region. According to Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, the United States was “asserting our own position as a Pacific power.” But need this lead to nuclear war? Not necessarily. And yet, there are signs that it could. After all, both the United States and China possess large numbers of nuclear weapons. The U.S. government threatened to attack China with nuclear weapons during the Korean War and, later, during the conflict over the future of China’s offshore islands, Quemoy and Matsu. In the midst of the latter confrontation, President Dwight Eisenhower declared publicly, and chillingly, that U.S. nuclear weapons would “be used just exactly as you would use a bullet or anything else.” Of course, China didn’t have nuclear weapons then. Now that it does, perhaps the behavior of national leaders will be more temperate. But the loose nuclear threats of U.S. and Soviet government officials during the Cold War, when both nations had vast nuclear arsenals, should convince us that, even as the military ante is raised, nuclear saber-rattling persists. Some pundits argue that nuclear weapons prevent wars between nuclear-armed nations; and, admittedly, there haven’t been very many—at least not yet. But the Kargil War of 1999, between nuclear-armed India and nuclear-armed Pakistan, should convince us that such wars can occur. Indeed, in that case, the conflict almost slipped into a nuclear war. Pakistan’s foreign secretary threatened that, if the war escalated, his country felt free to use “any weapon” in its arsenal. During the conflict, Pakistan did move nuclear weapons toward its border, while India, it is claimed, readied its own nuclear missiles for an attack on Pakistan. At the least, though, don’t nuclear weapons deter a nuclear attack? Do they? Obviously, NATO leaders didn’t feel deterred, for, throughout the Cold War, NATO’s strategy was to respond to a Soviet conventional military attack on Western Europe by launching a Western nuclear attack on the nuclear-armed Soviet Union. Furthermore, if U.S. government officials really believed that nuclear deterrence worked, they would not have resorted to championing “Star Wars” and its modern variant, national missile defense. Why are these vastly expensive—and probably unworkable—military defense systems needed if other nuclear powers are deterred from attacking by U.S. nuclear might? Of course, the bottom line for those Americans convinced that nuclear weapons safeguard them from a Chinese nuclear attack might be that the U.S. nuclear arsenal is far greater than its Chinese counterpart. Today, it is estimated that the U.S. government possesses over five thousand nuclear warheads, while the Chinese government has a total inventory of roughly three hundred. Moreover, only about forty of these Chinese nuclear weapons can reach the United States. Surely the United States would “win” any nuclear war with China. But what would that “victory” entail? A nuclear attack by China would immediately slaughter at least 10 million Americans in a great storm of blast and fire, while leaving many more dying horribly of sickness and radiation poisoning. The Chinese death toll in a nuclear war would be far higher. Both nations would be reduced to smoldering, radioactive wastelands. Also, radioactive debris sent aloft by the nuclear explosions would blot out the sun and bring on a “nuclear winter” around the globe—destroying agriculture, creating worldwide famine, and generating chaos and destruction.

#### Prefer specific scenarios - even if things make war more difficult it doesn’t make it unthinkable

James Wood Forsyth, Professor, National Security Studies and Thomas E. Griffith Jr., Dean of Faculty and Academic Programs, National War College, "Through the Glass Darkly: The Unlikely Demise of Great-Power War," STRATEGIC STUDIES QUARTERLY, Fall 2007, http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA509123

The United States cannot prepare to put down any and all potential rivals. The costs of such an undertaking would quickly prove to be enormous, especially when domestic spending on programs like social security and Medicare are factored into the security equation. Over the long haul rivals will emerge, and there is little the United States can do except balance against them, as they will prepare to balance against us. In such a world, where states compete for power, one must be concerned with survival. That being the case, it is worth remembering that the most serious threats to the great powers have historically stemmed from other great powers. In the years ahead, as strong challengers emerge, conflicts will arise, making war among the great powers more, not less, likely. 49 Contrary to popular belief, we are not living in a whole new world. The events of September 11 and the wars that have followed have had a pronounced effect on US foreign and defense policy, but they have not done away with the state system. The world is still made up of states that must look out for themselves. To pretend otherwise is to neglect history or to fall prey to presentism—something common among pundits but dangerous for statesmen and men and women of the armed forces. Historically, the most efficient and effective way to ensure state security is through military means. Thus, the importance of the balance of power, which exists to prevent one great power from dominating the rest, has not diminished. Instead, it has been reinvigorated as states are reminded of the need to defend themselves. The implications of acknowledging the possibility of a great-power war are easier to grasp than to implement. Despite the urgency of the war in Iraq, we need to think seriously about what a great-power war would look like, how it could occur and be prevented, and how it would be fought so that we can gain some understanding about the equipment and forces needed to fight and win. The groundwork for the technologies needed for such a contest needs to be laid today. The difficulties in putting armor on vehicles for Iraq pale in comparison to creating the lead time and resources needed to fight a great-power war. Failing to do so risks lives and jeopardizes US security goals. This does not mean that we should ignore current threats or overlook the need to relieve misery and suffering around the world, what one strategist terms “minding the gap.” 50 As citizens, we should be concerned with the political and human consequences of poverty, ecological degradation, and population growth. We must also fully address the problem of terrorism. But as real as the consequences of poverty, ecological degradation, population growth, and terrorism might be, it is hard to come up with a realistic scenario involving these tragedies that would alter the balance of power. 51 Put simply, in an age of transformation, we cannot neglect the basics. Should the United States find itself in another great-power war, things that are taken for granted today, like air superiority or control of sea lanes, might come up short tomorrow. That technology, economics, democracy, and norms play a role in preventing great-power war is not the issue. The issue is whether they make it unthinkable. Regrettably, they do not, and because they do not, great-power war has a bright future, however tragic that might seem.

#### Most recent evidence proves nuclear winter causes extinction

Starr 12 [Steven Starr - Director of the Clinical Laboratory Science Program at the University of Missouri-Columbia, Associate member of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, has been published by the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, his writings appear on the websites of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, the Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology Center for Arms Control, Energy and Environmental Studies, Scientists for Global Responsibility, and the International Network of Scientists Against Proliferation, “What is nuclear darkness?,” <http://www.nucleardarkness.org/web/whatisnucleardarkness/>]

In a nuclear war, burning cities would create millions of tons of thick, black smoke. This smoke would rise above cloud level, into the stratosphere, where it would quickly spread around the planet. A large nuclear war would produce enough smoke to block most sunlight from reaching the Earth's surface. Massive absorption of warming sunlight by a global stratospheric smoke layer would rapidly create Ice Age temperatures on Earth . The cold would last a long time; NASA computer models predict 40% of the smoke would still remain in the stratosphere ten years after a nuclear war. Half of 1% of the explosive power of US-Russian nuclear weapons can create enough nuclear darkness to impact global climate. 100 Hiroshima-size weapons exploded in the cities of India and Pakistan would put up to 5 million tons of smoke in the stratosphere . The smoke would destroy much of the Earth's protective ozone layer and drop temperatures in the Northern Hemisphere to levels last seen in the Little Ice Age. Shortened growing seasons could cause up to 1 billion people to starve to death. A large nuclear war could put 150 million tons of smoke in the stratosphere and make global temperatures colder than they were 18,000 years ago during the coldest part of the last Ice Age. Killing frosts would occur every day for 1-3 years in the large agricultural regions of the Northern Hemisphere. Average global precipitation would be reduced by 45%. Earth's ozone layer would be decimated. Growing seasons would be eliminated. A large nuclear war would utterly devastate the environment and cause most people to starve to death . Deadly climate change, radioactive fallout and toxic pollution would cause already stressed ecosystems to collapse. The result would be a mass extinction event that would wipe out many animals living at the top of the food chains - including human beings.

#### Nuclear war will escalate --- restraint would invite aggression

Dennis Ray **Morgan 9**, Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, Yongin Campus - South Korea, Futures, Volume 41, Issue 10, December 2009, Pages 683-693

And what many people fail to realize is what a precarious, hair-trigger basis the nuclear web rests on. Any accident, mistaken communication, false signal or ‘‘lone wolf’ act of sabotage or treason could, in a matter of **a few minutes**, unleash the use of nuclear weapons, and once a weapon is used, then the likelihood of a **rapid escalation** of nuclear attacks is quite high while the likelihood of a limited nuclear war is actually **less probable** since each country would act under the ‘‘use them or lose them’’ strategy and psychology; restraint by one power would be interpreted as a weakness by the other, which could be exploited as a window of opportunity to ‘‘win’’ the war. In otherwords, once Pandora’s Box is opened, it will spread quickly, as it will be **the signal** for permission for anyone to use them. Moore compares swift nuclear escalation to a room full of people embarrassed to cough. Once one does, however, ‘‘everyone else feels free to do so. The bottom line is that as long as large nation states use internal and external war to keep their disparate factions glued together and to satisfy elites’ needs for power and plunder, these nations will attempt to obtain, keep, and inevitably use nuclear weapons. And as long as large nations oppress groups who seek selfdetermination, some of those groups will look for any means to fight their oppressors’’ [10]. In other words, as long as war and aggression are backed up by the implicit threat of nuclear arms, it is only a matter of time before the escalation of violent conflict leads to the actual use of nuclear weapons, and once even just one is used, it is very likely thatmany, if not all, will be used, leading to horrific scenarios of global death and the destruction of much of human civilization while condemning a mutant human remnant, if there is such a remnant, to a life of unimaginable misery and suffering in a nuclear winter.

### Solvency/Environment

#### **Sugar ethanol industry development is super slow---years before they have a chance to solve advantages**

Specht 13

[Jonathan-J.D. Wash. U St. Louis, Legal Advisor, “Raising Cane: Cuban Sugarcane Ethanol’s Economic and Environmental Effects on the United States,” Environmental Law & Policy Journal, Univ. of California Davis, Vol. 36:2, <http://environs.law.ucdavis.edu/issues/36/2/specht.pdf>]

Like all new capitalist industries to emerge in the post-Castro era, whatever ethanol industry arises will have to deal with the painful transition from socialism to capitalism. The Cuban sugarcane ethanol industry will face similar challenges such as that arise in the post-Fidel era. One of these challenges will be simply a lack of people with skills necessary for any industry. According to Edward Gonzalez and Kevin McCarthy of the RAND Corporation, "As a result of 40-plus years of communism, the labor force lacks the kinds of training managers, accountants, auditors, bankers, insurers, etc., that a robust market economy requires." n53 While these challenges will not be unique to Cuba's ethanol industry, they will put the country at a competitive disadvantage vis-a-vis existing ethanol exporters such as Brazil. This will be especially true if there is a significant lag time between the expiration of the ethanol tariff barriers at the end of 2011 and the eventual removal of the United [\*181] States trade embargo against Cuba.¶ Additionally, because Cuba's ethanol industry is currently almost non-existent, it will need a great deal of foreign expertise and investment to get started. However, such investments are unlikely to be made unless Cuba makes fundamental changes in its business climate. In the words of Gonzalez and McCarthy, "Capital investment, which Cuba's economy desperately needs and which is most likely to be supplied by foreign investors, will be difficult to attract without enforceable contracts, access to neutral adjudication of disputes, and a degree of predictability that has heretofore been lacking." n54 Any post-Castro government will likely begin to make such changes to increase the appeal of the island nation to foreign investment. However, implementing these changes will take time and trial and error, which will slow the creation of a sugarcane-based ethanol industry.

#### Sugarcane ethanol generates more pollution than previously thought
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University of Iowa researchers and their colleagues have shown that ethanol fuel producers in Brazil — the world's top producer of ethanol from sugarcane as an alternative to petroleum-based fuel — generate up to seven times more air pollutants than previously thought.¶ The study, titled "Increased estimates of air-pollution emissions from Brazilian sugarcane ethanol," is featured in the Nature Highlights section and published in the Dec. 11 advance online publication of the journal Nature Climate Change.¶ The research team used agricultural survey data from Brazil to calculate emissions of air pollutants and greenhouse gases from the entire production, distribution, and lifecycle of sugarcane ethanol from 2000 to 2008.¶ The estimated pollutants were 1.5 to 7.3 times higher than those from satellite-based methods, according to lead author Elliott Campbell of the University of California, Merced.¶ Greg Carmichael, Karl Kammermeyer Professor of Chemical and Biochemical Engineering in the UI College of Engineering and co-director of the Center for Global and Regional Environmental Research (CGRER), and UI assistant professor Scott Spak note that the findings reflect continued practices and trends that are a part of the production of sugarcane ethanol. These include the practice of burning sugarcane fields before harvest, as well as the fact that sugarcane production in Brazil continues to grow.¶ "We found that the vast majority of emissions come from burning the sugarcane fields prior to harvesting, a practice the Brazilian government has been moving to end," says Spak. "However, the sugarcane industry has been expanding rapidly and moving into more remote areas, which makes it much more difficult to enforce new regulations over this growing source of air pollution and greenhouse gases.¶ "As people try to determine how to integrate biofuels into the global economy, Brazilian sugarcane ethanol has often been considered a more environmentally friendly fuel source than U.S. corn ethanol. In fact, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency considers sugarcane ethanol an 'advanced biofuel' with fewer greenhouse gas emissions than conventional biofuels like corn ethanol. These new findings help us refine those estimates and move closer to making more informed comparisons between different fuel sources, and ultimately make better decisions about how to grow and use biofuels," Spak says.¶ In addition to Campbell, Carmichael, and Spak, co-researchers include C.C. Tsao and Y. Chen of the University of California, Merced, and Marcelo Mena-Carrasco of Universidad Andrés Bello, Santiago, Chile.¶ Campbell and Mena are UI College of Engineering alumni. Spak is an assistant professor with joint appointments in the UI Public Policy Center, School of Urban and Regional Planning, and the UI College of Engineering Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering.